

**REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 1, 5 and 11-14 are currently being amended, whereby the scope of these claims have not been affected by way of these amendments. In particular, these amendments have been made to provide more explicit antecedent basis for some claim features, as well as to fix minor grammatical errors found in some of these claims. Also, new claim 20 has been added.

This amendment amends and adds claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-20 are now pending in this application.

The drawings have been amended to correct minor problems found in the drawings. New replacement drawing sheets are also being submitted herewith. No new matter has been added.

In the Office Action, claims 1-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,230,189 to Sato et al. (hereinafter "Sato"). This rejection is traversed for at least the reasons given below.

Unlike the present invention as recited in claim 1, in Sato, the encoding/decoding unit 33 of Sato's network facsimile apparatus 2 performs compression/decompression using a predetermined compression/decompression method at the network facsimile apparatus 2 itself, and it does not receive a decoding or encoding program from an external source in order to perform this decoding or encoding. Put in another way, Sato's encoding/decoding unit 33 utilizes programs stored within his network facsimile apparatus 2 to perform an encoding/decoding function, and it does not output a decoding program to a terminal equipment so that the terminal equipment can execute the decoding

program at the terminal equipment in order to decode and view the image data that it receives from the facsimile apparatus.

Independent claim 3 recites, among other things, a decoding program signaling means for signaling that an acquisition request is a request for a decoding program for decoding image data, whereby the decoding program is sent to a terminal equipment so that the terminal equipment can receive the decoding program over a network (e.g., Internet) and execute the decoding program so that image data previously received from the facsimile apparatus can be displayed in a proper format. In Sato, as described in column 5, lines 39-43, his facsimile apparatus 2 performs encoding/decoding at the facsimile apparatus 2, and it does not output a decoding program to a requesting terminal apparatus so as to allow the requesting terminal apparatus to run the decoding program on image data previously received from the facsimile apparatus 2.

In the present invention according to independent claim 5, which is directed to the second embodiment, a WWW server includes a decoding program storage means in which a decoding program for decoding image data coded in accordance with a coding method is stored, and the WWW server also includes decoding program signaling means for outputting the decoding program in response to a request from a terminal equipment. Claim 5 also recites a facsimile apparatus that includes coding means for coding image data in accordance with a unique coding method. Sato does not teach or suggest these features. As clearly described in column 6, lines 39-43 of Sato, his encoding/decoding unit 33 is a part of his network facsimile apparatus 2, which clearly does not correspond in any way to a WWW server. Also, as explained above with respect to claims 1 and 3, Sato's encoding/decoding unit 33 does not output any decoding program to another unit so as to allow this other unit to perform a decoding operation using the decoding program.

With respect to independent claim 9, this claim recites the features of claim 1, but as steps in a method as opposed to elements in a system. Therefore, for the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1, claim 9 is patentable over Sato.

With respect to claim 10, this claim recites steps performed by any of the terminal apparatuses, whereby at least some of these steps are not disclosed, taught or suggested by Sato. For example, claim 10 recites the steps of: a) sending, when it is discriminated that the program execution description is present, a notification of an acquisition request for a decoding program to a facsimile apparatus, b) receiving a decoding program from the facsimile apparatus, and c) executing the decoding program by the facsimile apparatus. Sato, on the other hand, merely describes a network facsimile apparatus 2 that includes an encoding/decoding unit 33 that performs encoding or decoding at the network facsimile apparatus 2, and thus there is no teaching or suggestion in Sato of sending a decoding program from the network facsimile apparatus 2 to another unit, since Sato's network facsimile apparatus 2 performs its encoding/decoding "in house."

Dependent claim 11 recites steps performed by a facsimile apparatus according to the present invention, whereby those steps include: a) a first discrimination step of discriminating whether or not an acquisition request (sent by a terminal equipment) is an acquisition request for HTML document data, b) a second discrimination step of discriminating, when it is not discriminated by the first discrimination step that the acquisition request is an acquisition request for HTML document data, whether or not the acquisition request is an acquisition request for a decoding program, c) a decoding program signaling step of signaling, when it is discriminated by the second discrimination step that the acquisition request is an acquisition request for a decoding program, the decoding program to the terminal equipment, and d) a third discrimination step of discriminating, when it is not discriminated by the second discrimination step that the acquisition request is for a decoding program, whether or not the acquisition request is for image data.

As recited in the above steps of claim 11, the claimed terminal equipment has the capability of receiving three different types of acquisition requests, and to perform three different types of functions based on those different acquisition request. Sato, on the other hand, merely outputs decodes encoding image data

and sends the decoding output to a requesting terminal equipment, whereby at best this can correspond to only one type of discrimination performed based on one type of acquisition request received by Sato's network facsimile apparatus

2. Accordingly, Sato fails to disclose or suggest all of the steps discussed above with respect to claim 11.

Dependent claim 12 recites features similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 11, and thus claim 12 is patentable for reasons similar to those given above with respect to claim 11.

Independent claim 13 is a method claim directed to the second embodiment, whereby a WWW server outputs a decoding program for decoding image data in accordance with a coding method, to a requesting terminal equipment in response to a request from the requesting terminal equipment. As explained above, Sato does not disclose, teach or suggest such a WWW server in his system.

Dependent claim 15 recites steps performed by any of the terminal equipments, and includes steps of: a) sending, when it is discriminated by the program execution description discrimination step that the program execution description is present in HTML document data (sent by a facsimile apparatus), a notification of an acquisition request for a decoding program to a WWW server, b) receiving the decoding program from the WWW server in response to the acquisition request, and c) executing the decoding program by the terminal equipment. As explained above with respect to other claims, Sato merely describes a system in which a network facsimile apparatus 2 performs decoding/encoding, whereby there is no teaching or suggestion in Sato for a WWW server storing a decoding program, and whereby there is no teaching or suggestion in Sato for a terminal equipment to receive and execute a decoding program sent to it from another component on a network.

Dependent claim 16 recites steps performed by any of the terminal equipments, and dependent claims 17-19 recites steps performed by the WWW server, whereby such steps are not disclosed, taught or suggested by Sato.

New dependent claim 20 has been added to recite a feature that can be found on page 33, lines 10-17 of the specification, whereby those features are not believed to be disclosed, taught or suggested by the cited art of record.

Accordingly, Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and an early indication of allowance is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

October 3, 2003  
Date

Phillip J. Articola  
Phillip J. Articola  
Registration No. 38,819

FOLEY & LARDNER  
Customer Number: 22428



22428

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE  
Telephone: (202) 672-5300  
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399